UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,444	02/17/2004	Peter M. Bonutti	782-A03-023	2789
	7590 04/10/200 NCO: FLEIT, KAIN, G	EXAMINER		
GUTMAN, BONGINI, & BIANCO P.L.			· KOTINI, PAVITRA	
21355 EAST DIXIE HIGHWAY SUITE 115		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MIAMI, FL 33180			3731	
		-		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAVS		04/10/2007	DAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/780,444	BONUTTI ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
•		Pavitra Kotini	3731	
The MAILIN Period for Reply	G DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
WHICHEVER IS L - Extensions of time may after SIX (6) MONTHS - If NO period for reply is - Failure to reply within the Any reply received by the second sec	TATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY ONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 from the mailing date of this communication. specified above, the maximum statutory period we set or extended period for reply will, by statute, ne Office later than three months after the mailing ustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a) This action i	to communication(s) filed on <u>17 Fe</u> s FINAL. 2b) ☐ This oplication is in condition for alloward cordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claim	•			
4) Claim(s) 1-4 4a) Of the at 5) Claim(s) 6) Claim(s) 7) Claim(s)	8 is/are pending in the application.	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers				
	ation is objected to by the Examine	r.		
•	(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc		Examiner.	
Applicant ma	y not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
<u> </u>	drawing sheet(s) including the correct declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s)	·		-	
1) Notice of References 2) Notice of Draftsperso	Cited (PTO-892) on's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
	re Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-42, drawn to a suture retainer, classified in class 606, subclass
 232.
- II. Claims 43-48, drawn to a method of securing a secure relative to body tissue, classified in class 128, subclass 898.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions group II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus such as a staple or clip.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required

Application/Control Number: 10/780,444 Page 3

Art Unit: 3731

because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

I. The species as best exemplified by figure 1

II. The species as best exemplified by figure 6

III. The species as best exemplified by figure 7

IV. The species as best exemplified by figure 9

V. The species as best exemplified by figure 14

VI. The species as best exemplified by figure 21

VII The species as best exemplified by figure 30B

VIII. The species as best exemplified by figure 31

IX. The species as best exemplified by figure 32

X. The species as best exemplified by figure 33B

XI. The species as best exemplified by figure 34A

XII. The species as best exemplified by figure 35A

XIII. The species as best exemplified by figures 36A-C

XIV. The species as best exemplified by figure 37A

XV. The species as best exemplified by figure 38A

XVI. The species as best exemplified by figure 39A

XVII. The species as best exemplified by figure 42

The species are independent or distinct because the inventions have a materially different design or mode of operation.

Applicant is <u>also</u> required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

A telephone call was made to Attorney Bianco on April 2, 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/780,444

Art Unit: 3731

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Page 5

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pavitra Kotini whose telephone number is 571-272-0624. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/780,444 Page 6

Art Unit: 3731

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

P.Kotini AU 3731.

> MICHAEL J. HAYES SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER